



TESTIMONY
OF THE
CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES
TO THE
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 27, 2009

CCM is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local governments - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate this opportunity to testify before this joint committee on issues of concern to towns and cities.

**Governor's Bill 6363 "An Act Implementing the Governor's Budget Recommendations
Concerning General Government, Conservation, Development,
Regulation, Protection, Judicial and Corrections"**

This bill would implement several of the Governor's budget recommendations, including (1) increasing local costs for the resident state trooper program, and (2) capping at the level of appropriation reimbursements to municipalities for the property tax exempt manufacturing machinery and equipment.

1. Resident State Trooper:

Section 5 of this bill would mandate that towns pay (i) 85% of the costs associated with maintaining the resident state trooper program, effective 7/1/09, and (ii) 100% of the costs of this vital program, effective 7/1/10. Towns currently relying on resident state troopers pay 70% of the costs.

While local officials know best the impact this recession has had on our critical local-state partnership – shifting the cost burden of public safety onto the backs of small-town Connecticut would place a new, hefty bill on the steps of town hall. By doing so – **such added costs could jeopardize the resident trooper program entirely – if municipalities stop participating in the program (a) it would harm decades of state and local investments in training and community relations, and (b) it would result in the State paying 100% of the costs for any trooper no longer in the RST program.**

The added costs to hometowns are real – and in the face of local layoffs, spending freezes, and deficits – they would be significant. The following information illustrates approximate annually costs to towns -- as a result of this new mandate proposed in Section 5 of HB 6363.¹

¹ CCM Municipal Survey

Town	Population	Fiscal Impact of Mandating 85%	Fiscal Impact of Mandating 100%
Mansfield	24,884	\$160,000	\$320,000
Somers	10,850	\$125,000	\$250,000
Tolland	14,631	\$110,000	N/a
Essex	6,753	\$100,000	\$120,000
Oxford	12,527	\$92,105	\$184,210
New Hartford	6,736	\$80,620	N/a
East Granby	5,122	\$63,000	\$126,000
North Stonington	5,212	\$63,000	\$130,000
Hebron	9,232	\$50,000	\$95,000
Preston	4,902	\$45,000	\$90,000
Woodbury	9,654	\$41,000	\$75,000
Bolton	5,116	\$30,000	\$60,000
Harwinton	5,564	\$28,000	\$56,100
Sherman	4,110	\$25,760	Over \$50,000
Southbury	19,678	\$25,000	\$50,000
Roxbury	2,319	\$23,046	\$43,000
Lebanon	7,354	\$23,035	N/a
Norfolk	1,652	\$21,083	\$42,166
Bethany	5,566	\$21,043	\$140,291
Kent	2,952	\$21,000	\$42,000
Salisbury	3,987	\$21,000	N/a
Durham	7,397	\$20,000	N/a
Ledyard	15,097	\$19,500	\$39,300
Killingworth	6,443	\$18,657	\$37,314
Chester	3,834	\$18,000	\$35,000
East Lyme	18,690	\$17,000	\$35,000
Washington	3,671	Over \$16,800	N/a
Deep River	4,673	\$16,000	N/a
Barkhamsted	3,665	\$15,000	\$30,000
Chaplin	2,528	\$15,000	\$30,000
Prospect	9,273	\$9,000	\$18,000 or \$20,000

CCM urges the Committee to **delete Section 5** of this bill -- maintain the current level of reimbursement by towns for the resident state trooper program -- and ensure that public safety in rural and suburban Connecticut is not compromised because of the recession. **Now is not the time to increase local costs and endanger existing local-state public safety prevention and response.**

2. MME Reimbursement Cap:

Among other things, Sections 2 through 4 of the bill **would cap at the level of appropriations reimbursements to municipalities under the PILOT program for manufacturing machinery and equipment.**

This personal property was taken off the local tax rolls by much-trumpeted legislation that would hold municipalities harmless from revenue losses by providing 100% reimbursement to local governments for the mandated property tax exemption. Capping reimbursements, as proposed by this bill, raises the very real possibility that reimbursement could fall below the 100% level.

That would remind municipal officials, once again, that State promises of support cannot be relied upon. It would be a step away from the kind of state-local partnership needed to get through tough economic times.

We urge you to delete these provisions from the bill.



If you have any questions, please call Bob Labanara or Gian-Carl Casa of CCM, at (203) 498-3000

